

BEYOND THE SIMPLEST INFLATIONARY COSMOLOGICAL MODELS

A.A. Starobinsky

Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow 117334, Russia

Though predictions of the simplest inflationary cosmological models with cold dark matter, flat space and approximately flat initial spectrum of adiabatic perturbations are remarkably close to observational data, we have to go beyond them and to introduce new physics not yet discovered in laboratories to account for all data. Two extensions of these models which seem to be the most actual at present time are discussed. The first one is the possibility that we are living at the beginning of a new inflation-like era. Then classical cosmological tests, like the luminosity distance or the angular size of distant objects as functions of redshift, as well as the behaviour of density perturbations in a dustlike matter component including baryons as a function of redshift, can provide information sufficient for the unambiguous determination of an effective potential of a corresponding present inflaton scalar field. The second, unrelated extension is a possibility of broken-scale-invariant cosmological models which have localized steps or spikes in the primordial perturbation spectrum. These features can be produced by fast phase transitions in physical fields other than an inflaton field in the early Universe during inflation and not far from the end of it. At present, it seems that the only scale in the spectrum around which we might see something of this type is $k = 0.05 h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

1. Introduction

It is clear now that viable cosmological models of the present Universe cannot be constructed without cold non-baryonic dark matter (CDM) and some model of the early Universe producing an approximately flat (or, Harrison-Zeldovich-like, $n_S \approx 1$) initial spectrum of scalar (adiabatic) perturbations. The two necessary ingredients correspond to physics not yet discovered in laboratories. In particular, since the simplest cosmic defect models without inflation have failed to fit observational data on the large-scale structure and angular anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature in the Universe, the only remaining viable and well elaborated scenario producing such a spectrum is the inflationary scenario with one effective scalar field (inflaton). The existence of the inflaton field with desired properties of its self-interaction potential is a hypothesis about physics at very high energies, only few orders of magnitude below the Planck scale (in addition to this hypothesis about fundamental physics, we have to assume that our Universe did really pass through an inflationary stage in the past). Two main candidates for non-baryonic CDM - the lightest supersymmetric particle or the axion - are still awaiting a direct discovery of any (or, even both) of them.

However, it has been already understood for several years that this amount of new physics is not sufficient for cosmology. To explain all existing observational data, one has to go further and to introduce even more new physics. Really, it is well established that the simplest Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) cosmological model with CDM, the flat 3-space ($\Omega_0 = 1$) and $n_S = 1$ does not fit observational data. Looking at viable extensions of this model presented in the Table 2 of the author's plenary talk at the "Cosmion-94" conference [1], it is clear that all of them require new physics. It enters either at very

low energies – producing an effective cosmological constant (the Λ CDM model), or at medium energies – giving a non-zero rest mass to one or several neutrino types (CHDM models), or, finally, at very high energies – resulting either in phase transitions during single (one-scalar-field) inflation (a second-order phase transition in the case of broken-scale-invariant (BSI) CDM models, or a first-order transition in the case of open CDM (OCDM) models), or in the appearance of a second inflaton scalar field (double inflation) that also lead to BSI CDM, or OCDM depending on parameters.

After three years passed from the "Cosmion-94" conference, all these four classes of models are still remaining viable in the sense that neither of them may be excluded completely. However, observational evidence (especially, the most recent one) becomes more and more directed towards the Λ CDM scale-invariant model. That is why I consider it as the model No. 1 at present, and I shall focus my main attention on it in Sec. 2. Still there exist some data, however inconclusive they might be, indicating that the present matter perturbation power spectrum has some feature at $k \approx 0.05 h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. If so, then it can be verified that this feature is present in the initial perturbation spectrum, too. It means that we are dealing with a BSI CDM model. This possibility does not remove need in a cosmological constant, so actually a BSI Λ CDM model is required for a better fit to data. This topic is considered in Sec. 3.

2. Cosmological models with a variable cosmological term

It has been known for many years that the flat FRW cosmological model with cold dark matter, a positive cosmological constant $\Lambda > 0$ ($\Omega_0 + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$) and an approximately flat spectrum of primordial adiabatic perturbations fits observational data better and has a larger admissible region of the parameters (H_0, Ω_0) than any other cosmological model with both inflationary and non-inflationary initial conditions (see, e.g., [2]). Here H_0 is the Hubble constant, $\Omega_0 = 8\pi G\rho_m/3H_0^2$ includes baryons and (mainly) non-baryonic dark matter, $\Omega_\Lambda \equiv \Lambda/3H_0^2$ and $c = \hbar = 1$. This conclusion was based on the following arguments: a) relation between H_0 and the age of the Universe t_0 , b) the fact that observed mass/luminosity ratio never leads to values more than $\Omega_0 \sim 0.4$ up to supercluster scales, c) comparison of cosmic microwave background temperature anisotropies, power spectra of density and velocity matter perturbations, present abundance of galaxy clusters with predictions of cosmological models with inflationary initial conditions; d) observed values of ρ_b/ρ_m in rich galaxy clusters confronted with the range for the present baryon density ρ_b admitted by the theory of primordial (Big Bang) nucleosynthesis. I don't include gravitational lensing tests (e.g., a number of lensed quasars) here, since conclusions based on them are less definite at present.

During last year two new pieces of strong evidence for $\Omega_0 < 1$ have appeared. The first (historically) of them is based on the evolution of abundance of rich galaxy clusters with redshift z [3]. Still, it should be noted that there have been already appeared some doubts on validity of the conclusion that $\Omega_0 = 1$ is really excluded [4]. Much better observational data expected in near future will help to resolve this dilemma unambiguously. The second, completely independent argument for $\Omega_0 = (0.2 - 0.4)$ follows from direct observations of supernovae (type Ia) explosions at high redshifts up to $z \sim 1$ [5]. On the other hand, no direct evidence for a negative spatial curvature of the Universe (i.e., for the OCDM model) has been found. Of course, the possibility to have *both* a positive cosmological constant and spatial curvature of any sign is not yet excluded, but, according to the "Okkam's

razor” principle, it would be desirable not to introduce one more basic novel feature of the Universe (spatial curvature) without conclusive observational evidence. In any case, in spite of many theoretical and experimental attempts to exorcize it, a Λ -term is back again.

It is clear that the introduction of a cosmological constant requires new and completely unknown physics in the region of ultra-low energies. Solutions with a cosmological constant occur in such fundamental theories as supergravity and M-theory. However, this cosmological constant is always negative and very large. As compared to such a basic ”vacuum” state, a very small and positive cosmological constant allowed in the present Universe may be thought as corresponding to the energy density ε_Λ of a highly excited (though still very symmetric) ”background” state. So, it need not be very ”fundamental”. But then it is natural to omit the assumption that it should be exactly constant. In this case the name ”a cosmological term” (or a Λ -term) is more relevant for it, so I shall use this one below. The principal difference between two kinds of non-baryonic dark matter - dustlike CDM and a Λ -term - is that the latter one is not gravitationally clustered up to scales $\sim 30 h^{-1}$ or more (otherwise we would return to the problem why Ω_0 observed from gravitational clustering is not equal to unity). Here $h = H_0/100 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

On the other hand, there exists a well-known strong argument showing that a Λ -term cannot change with time as fast as the matter density ρ_m and the Ricci tensor (i.e., $\propto t^{-2}$) during the matter dominated stage (for redshifts $z < 4 \cdot 10^4 h^2$). Really, if $\varepsilon_\Lambda \propto \rho_m$, so that $\Omega_\Lambda = \text{const}$, then matter density perturbations in the CDM+baryon component grow as $\delta \equiv \left(\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho}\right)_m \propto t^\alpha \propto (1+z)^{-3\alpha/2}$, $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{25-24\Omega_\Lambda}-1}{6}$. As a consequence, the total growth of perturbations Δ since the time of equality of matter and radiation energy densities up to the present moment is less than in the absence of the Λ -term. If $\Omega_\Lambda \ll 1$, then $\Delta(\Omega_\Lambda) = \Delta(0)(1 - (6.4 + 2 \ln h)\Omega_\Lambda)$. Since parameters of viable cosmological models are so tightly constrained that Δ may not be reduced by more than twice approximately, this type of a Λ -term cannot account for more than ~ 0.1 of the critical energy density (see [6] for detailed investigation confirming this conclusion). This, unfortunately, prevents us from natural explanation of the present Λ -term with $\Omega_\Lambda = (0.5 - 0.8)$ using ”compensation” mechanisms [7] or exponential potentials with sufficiently large exponents [8].

A natural and simple description of a variable Λ -term is just that which was so successively used to construct the simplest versions of the inflationary scenario, namely, a scalar field with some interaction potential $V(\varphi)$ minimally coupled to the Einstein gravity. Such an approach, though phenomenological, is nevertheless more consistent and fundamental than a commonly used attempt to describe a Λ -term by a barotropic ideal fluid with some equation of state. The latter approach cannot be made internally consistent in case of negative pressure. In particular, it generally leads to imaginary values of the sound velocity. On the contrary, no such problems arise using the scalar field description (this scalar field is called the Λ -field below). Of course, its effective mass $|m_\varphi^2| = |d^2V/d\varphi^2|$ should be very small to avoid gravitational clustering of this field in galaxies, clusters and superclusters. To make a Λ -term slowly varying, we assume that $|m_\varphi| \sim H_0 \sim 10^{-33} \text{ eV}$, or less (though this condition may be relaxed). Models with a time-dependent Λ -term were introduced more than ten years ago [9], and different potentials $V(\varphi)$ (all inspired by inflationary models) were considered: exponential [8, 10, 6, 11], inverse power-law [12], power-law [13], cosine [14, 11].

However, it is clear that since we know essentially nothing about physics at such energies, there exists no preferred theoretical candidate for $V(\varphi)$. In this case, it is more

natural to go from observations to theory, and to determine an effective phenomenological potential $V(\varphi)$ from observational data. The two new tests mentioned above are just the most suitable for this aim. Really, using the cluster abundance $n(z)$ determined from observations and assuming the Gaussian statistics of initial perturbations (the latter follows from the paradigm of one-field inflation, and it is in agreement with other observational data), it is possible to determine a *linear* density perturbation in the CDM+baryon dust-like component $\delta(z)$ for a fixed comoving scale $R \sim 8(1+z)^{-1}h^{-1}$ Mpc up to $z \sim 1$, either using the Press-Schechter approximation, or by direct numerical simulations of nonlinear gravitational instability in the expanding Universe. $\delta(z)$ can be also determined from observation of gravitational clustering (in particular, of the galaxy-galaxy correlation function) as a function of z . On the other hand, observations of SNe at different z yield the luminosity distance $D_L(z)$ through the standard astronomical expression $m = M + 5 \log D_L + 25$, where m is the observed magnitude, M is the absolute magnitude and D_L is measured in Mpc. One more related cosmological test is the angular size $\theta(z)$ of an extended object with a proper size d . This test is less accurate at present due to absence of objects with their size being fixed to a desired accuracy, still it is important.

Let us show now how to determine $V(\varphi)$ from either $\delta(z)$, or $D_L(z)$, or $\theta(z)$. Also, we investigate what additional information is necessary for an unambiguous solution of this problem in all these cases. The derivation of $V(\varphi)$ consists of two steps. First, the Hubble parameter $H \equiv \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = H(z)$ is determined. Here $a(t)$ is the FRW scale factor, $1+z \equiv a_0/a$, the dot means $\frac{d}{dt}$ and the index 0 denotes the present value of a corresponding quantity (in particular, $H(t_0) = H(z=0) = H_0$). In the case of SNe, the first step is almost trivial since the textbook expression for D_L reads:

$$D_L(z) = a_0(\eta_0 - \eta)(1+z), \quad \eta = \int_0^t \frac{dt}{a(t)}. \quad (1)$$

Therefore,

$$H(z) = \frac{da}{a^2 d\eta} = -(a_0 \eta')^{-1} = \left[\left(\frac{D_L(z)}{1+z} \right)' \right]^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

Here and below in Sec. 2, a prime denotes the derivative with respect to z .

The angular size is given by

$$\theta(z) = \frac{d}{a(\eta)(\eta_0 - \eta)} = \frac{d(1+z)}{a_0(\eta_0 - \eta)}. \quad (3)$$

Thus,

$$H(z) = -(a_0 \eta')^{-1} = \left[d \left(\frac{1+z}{\theta(z)} \right)' \right]^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

In physical units, the right-hand sides of Eqs. (2, 4) should be multiplied by c . Thus, both $D_L(z)$ and $\theta(z)$ define $H(z)$ uniquely.

More calculations are required to find $H(z)$ from $\delta(z)$. The system of background equations for the system under consideration is:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \left(\rho_m + \frac{\dot{\varphi}^2}{2} + V \right), \quad \rho_m = \frac{3\Omega_0 H_0^2 a_0^3}{8\pi G a^3}, \quad (5)$$

$$\ddot{\varphi} + 3H\dot{\varphi} + \frac{dV}{d\varphi} = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{H} = -4\pi G(\rho_m + \dot{\varphi}^2) . \quad (7)$$

Eq. (7) is actually the consequence of the other two equations.

We consider a perturbed FRW background which metric, in the longitudinal gauge (LG), has the form:

$$ds^2 = (1 + 2\Phi)dt^2 - a^2(t)(1 + 2\Psi)\delta_{lm}dx^l dx^m, \quad l, m = 1, 2, 3 . \quad (8)$$

The system of equations for scalar perturbations reads (the spatial dependence $\exp(ik_l x^l)$, $k_l k^l \equiv k^2$ is assumed):

$$\Phi = \Psi = \dot{v}, \quad \dot{\delta} = -\frac{k^2}{a^2}v + 3(\ddot{v} + H\dot{v} + \dot{H}v), \quad (9)$$

$$\dot{\Phi} + H\Phi = 4\pi G(\rho_m v + \dot{\varphi}\delta\varphi), \quad (10)$$

$$\left(-\frac{k^2}{a^2} + 4\pi G\dot{\varphi}^2\right)\Phi = 4\pi G(\rho_m \delta + \dot{\varphi}\delta\dot{\varphi} + 3H\dot{\varphi}\delta\varphi + \frac{dV}{d\varphi}\delta\varphi), \quad (11)$$

$$\delta\ddot{\varphi} + 3H\delta\dot{\varphi} + \left(\frac{k^2}{a^2} + \frac{d^2V}{d\varphi^2}\right)\delta\varphi = 4\dot{\varphi}\dot{\Phi} - 2\frac{dV}{d\varphi}\Phi . \quad (12)$$

Eq. (12) is the consequence of other ones. Here v and $\delta\varphi$ are, correspondingly, a velocity potential of a dustlike matter peculiar velocity and a Λ -field perturbation in LG, and δ is a *comoving* fractional matter density perturbation (in this case, it coincides with $\left(\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho}\right)_m$ in the synchronous gauge). In fact, all these perturbed quantities are gauge-invariant.

Now let us take a comoving wavelength $\lambda = k/a(t)$ which is much smaller than the Hubble radius $H^{-1}(t)$ up to redshifts $z \sim 5$. This corresponds to $\lambda \ll 2000 h^{-1}$ Mpc at present. Then, from Eq. (12),

$$\delta\varphi \approx \frac{a^2}{k^2}(4\dot{\varphi}\dot{\Phi} - 2\frac{dV}{d\varphi}\Phi), \quad |\dot{\varphi}\delta\dot{\varphi}| \sim \left|\frac{dV}{d\varphi}\delta\varphi\right| \sim \frac{a^2 H^4}{Gk^2}|\Phi| \ll \rho_m|\delta|. \quad (13)$$

It is at this place where we heavily used the condition $|m_\phi| \lesssim H_0$. In particular, it gives us a possibility to estimate $|\dot{\Phi}|$ as $H|\Phi|$ and $|\delta\dot{\varphi}|$ as $H|\delta\varphi|$. On the other hand, it is clear that this condition may be somewhat relaxed without destroying the last inequality in Eq. (13). As a result, the Λ -field is practically unclustered at the scale involved. Now the last of Eqs. (9) and Eq. (11) may be simplified to:

$$\dot{\delta} = -\frac{k^2}{a^2}v, \quad -\frac{k^2}{a^2}\Phi = 4\pi G\rho_m\delta . \quad (14)$$

Combining this with the first of Eqs. (9), we return to a well-known equation for δ in the absence of the Λ -field:

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G\rho_m\delta = 0 . \quad (15)$$

It is not possible to solve this equation analytically for an arbitrary $V(\varphi)$. Remarkably, the inverse dynamical problem, i.e. the determination of $H(a)$ given $\delta(a)$, is solvable. After changing the argument in Eq. (15) from t to a ($\frac{d}{dt} = aH\frac{d}{da}$), we get a first order linear differential equation for $H^2(a)$:

$$a^2\frac{d\delta}{da}\frac{dH^2}{da} + 2\left(a^2\frac{d^2\delta}{da^2} + 3a\frac{d\delta}{da}\right)H^2 = \frac{3\Omega_0 H_0^2 a_0^3 \delta}{a^3} . \quad (16)$$

The solution is:

$$H^2 = \frac{3\Omega_0 H_0^2 a_0^3}{a^6} \left(\frac{d\delta}{da} \right)^{-2} \int_0^a a \delta \frac{d\delta}{da} da = 3\Omega_0 H_0^2 \frac{(1+z)^2}{\delta'^2} \int_z^\infty \frac{\delta|\delta'|}{1+z} dz . \quad (17)$$

Putting $z = 0$ in this expression for H , we arrive to the expression of Ω_0 through $\delta(z)$:

$$\Omega_0 = \delta'^2(0) \left(3 \int_0^\infty \frac{\delta|\delta'|}{1+z} dz \right)^{-1} . \quad (18)$$

Of course, observations of gravitational clustering can hardly provide the function $\delta(z)$ for too large z (say, for $z > 5$). However, $\delta(z)$ in the integrands in Eqs. (17,18) may be well approximated by its $\Omega_0 = 1$ behaviour (i.e., $\delta \propto (1+z)^{-1}$) already for $z > (2-3)$. If massive neutrinos are present, one should use here the expression with α written above and with Ω_Λ substituted by Ω_ν/Ω_0 (it is assumed that ρ_m includes massive neutrinos, too).

Using Eq. (18), Eq. (17) can be represented in a more convenient form:

$$\frac{H^2(z)}{H^2(0)} = \frac{(1+z)^2 \delta'^2(0)}{\delta'^2(z)} - 3\Omega_0 \frac{(1+z)^2}{\delta'^2(z)} \int_0^z \frac{\delta|\delta'|}{1+z} dz . \quad (19)$$

Thus, $\delta(z)$ uniquely defines the ratio $H(z)/H_0$. Of course, appearance of derivatives of $\delta(z)$ in these formulas shows that sufficiently clean data are necessary, but one may expect that such data will soon appear. Let us remind also that, for $\Lambda \equiv \text{const}$ ($V(\varphi) \equiv \text{const}$), we have

$$H^2(z) = H_0^2(1 - \Omega_0 + \Omega_0(1+z)^3), \quad q_0 \equiv -1 + \left(\frac{d \ln H}{d \ln(1+z)} \right)_{z=0} = \frac{3}{2} \Omega_0 - 1 , \quad (20)$$

where q_0 is the acceleration parameter.

The second step - the derivation of $V(\varphi)$ from $H(a)$ - is very simple. One has to rewrite Eqs. (5, 7) in terms of a and take their linear combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} 8\pi G V(\varphi) &= aH \frac{dH}{da} + 3H^2 - \frac{3}{2} \Omega_0 H_0^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^3 , \\ 4\pi G a^2 H^2 \left(\frac{d\varphi}{da} \right)^2 &= -aH \frac{dH}{da} - \frac{3}{2} \Omega_0 H_0^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^3 , \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and then exclude a from these equations, since the second of Eqs. (21) is integrated trivially.

To show explicitly how the second step proceeds for a given $H(z)$, let us consider the case when a cosmological term mimics the negative spatial curvature dynamically, while the real spatial geometry of the Universe remains flat. That is, we assume that

$$H^2(z) = H_0^2 \left(\Omega_0(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_0)(1+z)^2 \right) . \quad (22)$$

Integration of the second of Eqs. (21) gives

$$\frac{a}{a_0} = \frac{\Omega_0}{1-\Omega_0} \sinh^2 \left(\sqrt{\pi G} (\varphi - \varphi_0 + \varphi_1) \right) , \quad \varphi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi G}} \ln \left(\frac{\sqrt{1-\Omega_0} + 1}{\sqrt{\Omega_0}} \right) . \quad (23)$$

Substituting this into the first of Eqs. (21), we find the expression for the effective potential:

$$V(\varphi) = \frac{(1 - \Omega_0)^3 H_0^2}{4\pi G \Omega_0^2} \frac{1}{\sinh^4 \left(\sqrt{\pi G} (\varphi - \varphi_0 + \varphi_1) \right)}. \quad (24)$$

At early times at the matter dominated stage, this potential diverges $\propto (\varphi - \varphi_0 + \varphi_1)^{-4}$.

Therefore, the model of a Λ -term considered in this paper can account for *any* observed forms of $D_L(z)$, $\theta(z)$ and $\delta(z)$ which, in turn, can be transformed into a corresponding effective potential $V(\varphi)$ of the Λ -field. The only condition is that the functions $H(z)$ obtained by these three independent ways should coincide within observational errors. $D_L(z)$ and $\theta(z)$ uniquely determine $V(\varphi)$, if Ω_0 is given additionally (the latter is required at the second step, in Eqs. (21)). $\delta(z)$ uniquely determines $V(\varphi)$ up to the multiplier H_0^2 , the latter has to be given additionally to fix an overall amplitude.

Observational tests which can falsify this model do exist. In particular, a contribution to large-angle $\frac{\Delta T}{T}$ CMB temperature anisotropy due to the integrated (or, non-local) Sachs-Wolfe effect presents a possibility to distinguish the model from more complicated models, e.g., with non-minimal coupling of the Λ -field to gravity or to CDM. However, the latter test is not an easy one, since this contribution is rather small and partially masked by cosmic variance.

Still it may appear finally that the cosmological term is really constant: $V(\varphi) = V_0 = \varepsilon_\Lambda = \text{const}$, $\varphi = \varphi_0 = \text{const}$. Then it represents a new fundamental constant of nature. A question is often asked: how is it possible to obtain such a small value of ε_Λ in Planck units from known physical constants? This question is actually not physical, but an arithmetic one. So, without trying to construct an underlying physical model for the Λ -term, let me propose a toy arithmetic expression for ε_Λ (of course, one of infinite number of possible ones) to show that there is no problem here from the mathematical point of view:

$$\varepsilon_\Lambda = \frac{M_P^4}{(2\pi^2)^3} \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\alpha}\right) = e^{-283.02} M_P^4 = 10^{-122.91} M_P^4, \quad (25)$$

where $M_P = \sqrt{G}$ is the Planck mass and α is the fine-structure constant. In usual units, $\varepsilon_\Lambda = 10^{-123} c^5 / G^2 \hbar$. Eq. (25) leads to the "prediction":

$$\Omega_\Lambda h^2 \equiv (1 - \Omega_0) h^2 \approx 0.335. \quad (26)$$

In particular, for $\Omega_0 = 0.3$, it gives $H_0 = 69 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ – just in the expected region!

3. A feature in the matter power spectrum and physical mechanisms to produce it

The main importance of the inflationary scenario of the early Universe for the theory of large scale structure in the present Universe is that the former scenario predicts (in its simplest realizations) an approximately flat, or scale-invariant, spectrum ($n_S(k) \equiv d \ln P_0(k) / d \ln k \approx 1$) of initial adiabatic perturbations. By the simplest realizations I mean, as usually, inflationary models with one effective slow-rolling scalar (inflaton) field. Of course, the physical nature of the inflaton may be completely different in these models, but it does not matter for observations, in particular, for the large scale structure. This prediction has been confirmed already, if by $n_S(k)$ we understand the slope of an initial

power spectrum of density perturbations $P_0(k)$ smoothed over the range $\Delta \ln k \sim 1$. To see this, it is even not necessary to use results for n_S following from the COBE experiment (though they also tell us the same), it is sufficient to compare the COBE normalization of perturbations for scales of the order of the present cosmological horizon R_h with the σ_8 normalization that follows, e.g., from the present cluster abundance. The difference in the amplitude of initial perturbations at these two scales which are divided by approximately 3 orders of magnitude is only 2 – 2.5 times for the standard CDM model and even less for other models, e.g., the Λ CDM model. In addition, these numbers give us an idea about the magnitude of expected deviations from the exact scale invariance: $|n_S - 1| \leq 0.3$ (once more, we are speaking about a smoothed n_S). Observational effects related to the part of $P_0(k)$ between these two points (CMB temperature fluctuations at medium and small angles, galaxy-galaxy and cluster-cluster correlations, peculiar velocities of galaxies) also do not require larger smooth deviations from $n_S = 1$.

The observational fact that the smoothed slope n_S cannot be significantly different from 1 does not exclude the possibility of *local* strong deviations from the flat spectrum, i.e., steps and/or spikes in $P_0(k)$. Of course, one should not expect such a behaviour to be typical, we shall see below that if it happens at all, it occurs at some preferred scales which themselves become new fundamental parameters of a cosmological model. Do we have any observational evidence for an existence of such preferred scales at the Universe? At present, only one scale in the Fourier space, $k = k_0 = 0.05h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, remains a candidate for this role, and it seems that the spectrum is smooth for larger k (from galaxy-galaxy correlation data) and for smaller k (from CMB data). As for this scale itself, there exists an evidence for a peculiar behaviour (in the form of a sharp peak) in the Fourier power spectrum of rich Abell - ACO clusters (with richness class $R \geq 0$ and redshifts $z \leq 0.12$) around it [15] (see also [16, 17]). This anomalous behaviour persists if the distant border for the cluster sample is reduced to $z = 0.07 - 0.08$ [18]. If we assume that the cluster power spectrum is proportional to the power spectrum of whole matter in the Universe (with some constant biasing factor), and calculate corresponding *rms* multipole values C_l of angular fluctuations of the CMB temperature, they appear to be in a good agreement with existing results of medium-angle experiments [19]. Moreover, if $\Omega_m = 1$, the peak in the power spectrum inferred from the cluster data just explains an excess in C_l for $l = 200 - 300$ observed in the Saskatoon experiment. The agreement becomes even better in the case of the Λ CDM model [20].

On the other hand, there is no peak at $k = k_0$ in the power spectrum of both APM clusters (which are generally less rich than Abell-ACO clusters) and APM galaxies [21] (though some less prominent feature at this scale may still exist in the latter spectrum [22]), and the maximum in these spectra seems to be shifted to $k \sim 0.03h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Leaving a solution of this discrepancy to more complete future surveys, let us consider theoretical predictions.

It is possible to produce local features in the initial spectrum even remaining (at least, formally) inside the standard paradigm of one-field inflation. The only thing which should be relaxed is the requirement of the analyticity of an inflaton effective potential $V(\phi)$ at all points (the ϕ inflaton field in the early Universe should not be confused with the φ Λ -field used to describe a variable cosmological term in the previous section).

So, let me admit that $V(\phi)$ has some kind of discontinuity at a point $\phi = \phi_0$. Of course, really this discontinuity is smoothed in a very small vicinity of ϕ_0 . Three cases are the most interesting.

1. $[V] = [V'] = 0$, $[V''] \neq 0$ at $\phi = \phi_0$.

Here $[]$ means the jump in the quantity considered, namely, $[A] \equiv A(\phi_0 + 0) - A(\phi_0 - 0)$, and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to ϕ . If we assume that the slow-roll conditions $V'^2 \ll 48\pi GV^2$, $|V''| \ll 24\pi GV$ are satisfied near the point $\phi = \phi_0$, then in the zero-order approximation the standard result for a perturbation spectrum is valid:

$$P_0(k) = \frac{k^4 R_h^4(t)}{400} h^2(k), \quad k^3 h^2(k) = 18 \left(\frac{H^6}{V'^2} \right)_k, \quad H \equiv \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \approx \sqrt{\frac{8\pi GV}{3}}, \quad (27)$$

where the index k means that the quantity is evaluated at the moment of the first Hubble radius crossing ($k = aH$) at the inflationary stage. The result for $P_0(k)$, in contrast to the metric perturbation $h^2(k)$ defined in the ultra-synchronous gauge (h is equal to 1/3 of the trace of a spatial metric perturbation in this gauge), refers to the matter-dominated stage where $R_h(t) = 2/H = 3t$. Note also that there is no necessity in adding the multiplier $\mathcal{O}(1)$ here.

So, in this case $P_0(k)$ is continuous at $k = k_0$ but its slope $n_S(k)$ has a step-like behaviour there (similar to the case considered in [16, 18]). However, due to small corrections to Eq. (27) which are beyond the slow-roll approximation, it appears that n_S cannot be obtained simply by differentiating (27), and I expect that the sharp behaviour in n_S will be smoothed near k_0 . This question is still under consideration.

2. $[V] = 0$, $[V'] \neq 0$ at $\phi = \phi_0$.

Now the second of the slow-roll conditions is violated, while we can choose parameters of the jump in such a way that the first condition is still valid. Naive application of Eq.(27) would give a step in $P_0(k)$,. However, the slow-roll approximation is clearly not applicable. The exact solution for a local part of the spectrum near the point k_0 was obtained in [23]. It reads:

$$k^3 h^2(k) = \frac{18H_0^6}{V'^2} D^2(y), \quad H_0 = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi GV(\phi_0)}{3}}, \quad V'_\pm = V'(\phi_0 \pm 0) > 0, \quad y = \frac{k}{k_0},$$

$$D^2(y) = 1 - 3 \left(\frac{V'_-}{V'_+} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{y} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{y^2} \right) \sin 2y + \frac{2}{y} \cos 2y \right) \quad (28)$$

$$+ \frac{9}{2} \left(\frac{V'_-}{V'_+} - 1 \right)^2 \frac{1}{y^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{y^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{y^2} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{y^2} \right) \cos 2y - \frac{2}{y} \sin 2y \right).$$

The function $D^2(y)$ has a step-like behaviour with superimposed oscillations. Since $D(0) = V'_-/V'_+$, $D(\infty) = 1$, the spectrum approaches the flat spectrum if $|\ln(k/k_0)| \gg 1$. As compared with the flat spectrum, the spectrum (28) has more power at large scales (small k) if $V'_- > V'_+$, and more power on small scales in the opposite case. The shape of this function is universal (in the sense that it does not depend on a way of smoothing the jump in V' , if it is made in a sufficiently small vicinity of ϕ_0), it depends on the ratio V'_-/V'_+ only.

In the absence of a cosmological term, we have to choose the case $V'_- > V'_+$ to fit observational data, and then it is not possible to have a significant bump in the spectrum. However, if the cosmological term is positive, a possibility of an inverted step ($V'_- < V'_+$) arises [20]. In this case, the spectrum (28) can match the spectrum found in [15] rather well.

3. $[V] \neq 0$ at $\phi = \phi_0$.

In this case, there is no universal spectrum, and the answer depends on a concrete way of smoothing $V(\phi)$ at $\phi = \phi_0$. Some general results are presented in [23], typically $P_0(k)$ acquires a large bump, however, a well may appear, too. Fortunately, there is no need in further consideration of this more complicated case, since observational data do not require such a strong non-analyticity. Looking at the results presented in [15, 18] it is clear that they lie somewhere between the first two cases.

Therefore, a general lesson from these considerations is that peculiarities in $V(\phi)$ can produce local features in $P_0(k)$ where the slope n_S is significantly different from unity. However, these features cannot be too sharp, in particular, both $P_0(k)$ and $n_S(k)$ are expected to be continuous functions of k .

So far, the treatment of peculiar points was purely mathematical. However, if we are seeking for a physical explanation of such behaviour of $V(\phi)$, we have to go beyond the paradigm of one-field inflation to a more complicated case of two-field inflation. Inflation with two scalar field is a very rich physical model which includes double inflation, hybrid inflation, open inflation, etc. as specific cases. In our case it is sufficient to assume that the second scalar field χ , in contrast to the inflaton field ϕ , is always in the regime $|m_\chi^2| \gg H^2$. So, it is not dynamically important during the whole inflation. However, it is coupled to ϕ (e.g., through the term $g^2\phi^2\chi^2$) and, as a result of change in ϕ during inflation, the field χ experiences a fast phase transition approximately 60 e-folds before the end of inflation. If parameters of an interaction potential $V(\phi, \chi)$ are such that the phase transition may be considered as an equilibrium one, then its net effect on inflation appears in the change of the equilibrium effective potential $V_{eff}(\phi) \equiv V(\phi, \chi_{eq}(\phi))$ only. If the transition is a second-order one, with no jump in χ_{eq} , the first case considered above takes place. If the transition is a first-order one, with a non-zero jump in χ_{eq} , we arrive to the second case.

This research was partially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Grant 96-02-17591, and by the Russian Research Project "Cosmomicrophysics".

References

- [1] A.A. Starobinsky, in *Cosmoparticle Physics. 1. Proc. of the 1st International Conference on Cosmoparticle Physics "Cosmion-94" (Moscow, 5-14 Dec. 1994)*, eds. M. Yu. Khlopov, M.E. Prokhorov, A.A. Starobinsky, J. Tran Thanh Van, Edition Frontiers (1996), p. 141 (astro-ph/9603074).
- [2] L.A. Kofman and A.A. Starobinsky, *Pisma v Astron. Zh.* **11**, 643 (1985) [*Sov. Astron. Lett.* **11**, 271 (1985)]; L.A. Kofman, N.Yu. Gnedin and N.A. Bahcall, *Astroph. J.* **413**, 1 (1993); J.P. Ostriker and P.J. Steinhardt, *Nature* **377**, 600 (1995); J.S. Bagla, T. Padmanabhan and J.V. Narlikar, *Comm. on Astroph.* **18**, 275 (1996) (astro-ph/9511102).
- [3] N.A. Bahcall, X. Fan and R. Cen, *Astroph. J. (Lett.)* **485**, L53 (1997); X. Fan, N.A. Bahcall and R. Cen, *Astroph. J. (Lett.)* **490**, L123 (1997).
- [4] R. Sadat, A. Blanchard and J. Oukbir, *Astron. Astroph.* **329**, 21 (1997).

- [5] P.M. Garnavich, R.P. Kirshner, P. Challis *et al.*, *Astroph. J. (Lett.)* **493**, L53 (1998); S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, M. Della Valle *et al.*, *Nature* **391**, 51 (1998).
- [6] P.G. Ferreira and M. Joyce, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4740 (1997); *Phys. Rev.* **D58**, 023503 (1998); E.J. Copeland, A.R. Liddle and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev.* **D57**, 4686 (1998).
- [7] A.D. Dolgov, in *The Very Early Universe*, ed. G.W. Gibbons, S.W. Hawking and S.T.C. Siklos, Cambridge University Press (1983), p. 449; A.D. Dolgov, *Pisma v ZhETF* **41**, 280 (1985) [*JETP Lett.* **41**, 345 (1985)].
- [8] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys.* **B302**, 668 (1988); *Astron. Astroph.* **301**, 321 (1995).
- [9] M. Özer and M.O. Taha, *Phys. Lett.* **B171**, 363 (1986); *Nucl. Phys.* **B287**, 776 (1987); M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Lett.* **B188**, 38 (1987); K. Freese, F.C. Adams, J.A. Frieman and E. Mottola, *Nucl. Phys.* **B287**, 797 (1987); M. Gasperini, *Phys. Lett.* **B194**, 347 (1987); N. Weiss, *Phys. Lett.* **B197**, 42 (1987).
- [10] B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev.* **D37**, 3406 (1988).
- [11] P.T.P. Viana and A.R. Liddle, *Phys. Rev.* **D57**, 674 (1998).
- [12] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Astroph. J. (Lett.)* **325**, L17 (1988).
- [13] N. Weiss, *Phys. Rev.* **D39**, 1517 (1989).
- [14] J.A. Frieman, C.T. Hill, A. Stebbins and I. Waga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 2077 (1995); K. Coble, S. Dodelson and J. Frieman, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 1851 (1997).
- [15] J. Einasto, M. Einasto, S. Gottlöber *et al.*, *Nature* **385**, 139 (1997).
- [16] J. Einasto, M. Einasto, P. Frish *et al.*, *MNRAS* **289**, 801, 813 (1997).
- [17] J. Einasto, *Gravit. & Cosmol.* **4**, Suppl., 110 (1998).
- [18] J. Retzlaf, S. Borgani, S. Gottlöber *et al.*, *NewA*, accepted (1998) (astro-ph/9709044).
- [19] F. Atrio-Barandela, J. Einasto, S. Gottlöber *et al.*, *Pisma v ZhETF* **66**, 373 (1997) [*JETP Lett.* **66**, 397 (1997)].
- [20] J. Lesgourgues, D. Polarski and A.A. Starobinsky, *MNRAS* **297**, 769 (1998).
- [21] H. Tadros, G. Efstathiou and G. Dalton, *MNRAS* **296**, 995 (1998).
- [22] E. Gaztanaga and C.M. Baugh, *MNRAS* **294**, 229 (1998).
- [23] A.A. Starobinsky, *Pisma v ZhETF* **55**, 477 (1992) [*JETP Lett.* **55**, 489 (1992)].